## DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to the amendment filed on 05/31/2011. Claims 1, 3, 5-10, 14-20, 25, 27, 30, 32-37, and 39-46 are pending in this Action. Claims 2, 4, 12, 13, 21-24, 26, 28, 31, and 38 had been previously cancelled.

### *Remark*

In response to the Office Action mailed 02/28/2011, claims 1 and 25 have been amended, no claim has been cancelled, and no new claim has been added.

The Applicant's amendment regarding specification objection has been accepted by the Examiner. Therefore, prior specification objection has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments with respect to newly amended claims 1 and 25 have been considered but are not persuasive. The newly amended limitations necessitate the finality of the Actions.

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments filed 05/31/2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the applicant's arguments in pages 14-16 of the Remark that neither Vianello or Talib discloses or suggests "the automatically creating two or more segments of the narrowed hit-list by grouping the resources according to one of a plurality of attribute dimensions", "receiving a selection of two or more

segments through the user interface", and "providing, to the user, a subset of the

narrowed hit-list based on the selected two or more segments", as recited in

amended claims 1 and 25,

the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable

interpretation in light of the specification.  See MPEP 2111 [R-1]

Interpretation of Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation

During patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the

broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.'  Applicant

always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad

interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued,

will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-

51 (CCPA 1969).

The combination of Vianello in view of Talib discloses all the limitations of

claims 1 and 25 including above limitations. Talib in figures 7-10, 13, and 14 and

its associated text, especially paragraphs 117-139, discloses providing a

narrowed search results to a user in which the system automatically categorizing

the narrowed search list to multiple segments based on an attribute dimension

(e.g. location). Each segment is associated with a generated number of hits (i.e.

statistics), for example "Virginia (603)". A user can select multiple segments

provided to the user, such as Alaska, Alabama, or Virginia. After the selection, a

sub-set of the segments are displayed to the user, for example upon selection of

the "Virginia" segment the, sub-segments of "Arlington", "Fairfax", etc. with their associated statistics are displayed to the user.

Therefore, Talib in the combination of Vianello in view of Talib discloses the limitations of "the automatically creating two or more segments of the narrowed hit-list by grouping the resources according to one of a plurality of attribute dimensions", "receiving a selection of two or more segments through the user interface", and "providing, to the user, a subset of the narrowed hit-list based on the selected two or more segments", as recited in amended claims 1 and 25.

Moreover, regarding the applicant's argument that Talib does not disclose "receiving a selection of two or more segments through the user interface" as recited in claims 1 and 25, because "the system of Talib merely allows the selection of a single category or sub-category at one time to 'drill down' a taxonomy,

the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The language of the claimed limitation of "receiving a selection of two or more segments through the user interface" does not require that the selections of two or more segments to occur at one time. A user can select multiple segments at different times. Therefore, the selection of segments in the Fig. 7-10 of Talib corresponds to the limitation of "receiving a selection of two or more segments through the user interface", as recited in claims 1 and 25.

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 5-10, 25, 27, 30, 32-37, and 39-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Vianello, US 7,424,438 B2 issued Sep. 9,

2008 in view of Talib et al., US 2001/0049674 A1 published Dec. 6, 2001 (Talib,

hereafter).

Regarding claim 1,

Vianello discloses **a method comprising:**

**storing a data source of resource profiles associated with a plurality**

**of resources, each resource the resources being at least one of a plurality**

**of_resource types** (See Vianello: Fig. 2, col. 14, line 25 et seq., col. 17, lines 33-

44, col. 15, line 10 et seq., and col. 22, line 11et seq., disclosing talent and

employer profiles as resource profiles);

**receiving, through a user interface, one or more first attributes of a**

**resource desired by a user; searching, using a processor, the data source**

**of resource profiles for profiles having one or more of the first attributes**

(See Vianello: Fig. 4, Fig. 10, Col. 26, line 9 et seq., and col. 2, line 35 et seq.,

disclosing search interfaces receiving search keywords or attributes from a user

and searching talent and job databases);

**providing, to the user, a hit-list of resources having the one or more**

**first attributes** (See Vianello: Fig. 4, step 409 and Fig. 10, step 1008);

**storing the narrowed hit-list as a collection of resources which is**

**used for further actions or stored as a persistent collection** (See Vianello:

Fig. 4, step 412 and Fig. 10, step 1010).

Vianello discloses all the limitations as stated above. Vianello further

discloses narrowing or refining the search results based on certain skills

possessed by talents (i.e., second attributes) (see Vianello: at least col., 24, lines

34-37 and col. 43, lines 1-12). However, Vianello does not explicitly disclose

**receiving one or more of second attributes of the resource through a**

**refinement user interface; searching, using a processor, the hit-list for**

**resources having the second attributes; providing, to the user, a narrowed**

**hit-list of resources having the first and second attributes; automatically**

**creating two or more segments of the narrowed hit-list by grouping the**

**resources according to one of a plurality of attribute dimensions;**

**generating, for the user, statistics associated with the segments; receiving**

**a selection of two or more segments through the user interface; and**

**providing, to the user, a subset of the narrowed hit-list based on the**

**selected two or more segments.**

On the other hand, Talib discloses receiving a second attribute (e.g. a

location) to refine and narrow the search results and providing the search results

having the search attributes to a user (See Talib: at least Fig. 7-10, and [0057]).

Talib further discloses automatically categorizing the narrowed search list to

multiple segments based on an attribute dimension (e.g. location), and each

category or segment is associated with a generated number of hits (i.e.

statistics), then a user can select a plurality of segments provided to the user; for

example the narrowed search result has been segmented based on location to

two or more segments (e.g. Alaska, Alabama, Virginia) with their associated

statistics, a user can select several of them and a subset of the segments are

provided to the user (See Talib: at least Fig. 5-10, [0047], and [0055]-[0060], and

[0102]-[0105]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Vianello

with Talib's teaching. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to incorporate

the above teachings of Talib into the teachings of Vianello in order to receive one

or more of second attributes of the resource through a refinement user interface;

search, using a processor, the hit-list for resources having the second attributes;

provide, to the user, a narrowed hit-list of resources having the first and second

attributes; automatically create segments of the narrowed hit-list by grouping the

resources according to one of a plurality of attribute dimensions; generate, for the

user, statistics associated with the segments; receive a selection of segments

through the user interface; and provide, to the user, a subset of the narrowed hit-

list based on the selected segments. The motivation for doing so would have

been to increase the efficiency of the system and uncovering the right information

without forcing user to go through numerous irrelevant search results through

narrowing the search result.

Regarding claim 5,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **defining the resource profiles by facets, attributes, and descriptions of the sources of the attributes** (See Vianello: Fig. 2, col. 14, line 25 et seq., col. 15, line 10 et seq., and col. 22, line 11et seq.).

Regarding claim 6,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **generating a pattern-based user interface of a search tool from the resource profile** (See Talib: Fig. 4-6).

Regarding claim 7,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **receiving at least one selected resource type through the refinement user interface; providing a second narrowed hit-list of resources having the selected resource type from the narrowed hit-list** (See Talib: at least Fig. 5-10, [0047], and [0055]-[0060], and [0102]-[0105], selecting a category (i.e., type) through the user interface to refine the search results and providing a narrowed search result having the particular category or type); **storing the narrowed hit-list as a collection of resources for using for further actions or storing as a persistent collection** (See Vianello: Fig. 4 and Fig. 10).

Regarding claim 8,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **storing the collection of resources dynamically or statically** (See Vianello: Fig. 4, Fig. 10 and col. 27, lines 30-34).

Regarding claims 9 and 10,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **aggregating the narrowed hit-list with an existing collection of resources, wherein the existing collection of resources comprises an historical listing of aggregated narrowed hit-lists** (See Vianello: Fig. 4 and Fig. 10 discloses storing of search results, therefore, every time a user save existing search results it would be added to the previous list).

Regarding claims 25, 27, 30, and 32-35,

the scope of claims 25, 27, 30, and 32-35 are substantially the same as claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, and 10, respectively. Therefore, claims 25, 27, 30, and 32-35 are rejected on the same basis as set forth for the rejections of claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, and 10, respectively.

Regarding claim 36,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **creating a layout of the segments of the narrowed hit-list by discrete values of an attribute dimension** (See Talib: at least Fig. 5-10, [0047], and [0055]-[0060], and [0102]-[0105]).

Regarding claim 37,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **the narrowed hit-list is displayed based on the resource type** (See Talib: at least Fig. 5-10, [0047], and [0055]-[0060], and [0102]-[0105]).

Regarding claim 39,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **wherein the resource type is a person and the attributes include at least one of licenses received, papers published, languages spoken, demographic information, title in an organization, activities** (See Vianello: Fig. 2, col. 14, line 25 et seq., disclosing the resource as talents which are persons having attributes such as address, language, licenses).

Regarding claim 40,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **wherein a plurality of selected resource types are received through the refinement user interface** (See Talib: at least Fig. 5-10, [0047], and [0055]-[0060], and [0102]-[0105]).

Regarding claim 41,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **combining the stored collection of resources with a third collection of resources to create a fourth collection of resources** (Vianello discloses saving the search results which are resources (e.g. talents), and every time a user save the search result it combines the new search results with the old results, Vianello: Fig. 4 and Fig. 10).

Regarding claim 42,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **storing a narrowed collection of resources by selecting a subset of the narrowed hit-list** (See Vianello: Fig. 4 and Fig. 10).

Regarding claim 43,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **storing a narrowed collection of resources by selecting a subset of the narrowed hit-list** (See Vianello: Fig. 4 and Fig. 10, discloses saving the search results and Coiera discloses typing a name for storing the search, see Coiera: [0061]).

Regarding claim 44,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **the narrowed hit-list includes heterogeneous resources** (See Talib: at least Fig. 5-10, [0047], and [0055]-[0060], and [0102]-[0105]).

Regarding claim 45,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **wherein the facets include at least one of collaboration, qualification, interests, and activities** (See Vianello: Fig. 2, col. 14, line 25 et seq., col. 17, lines 33-44, for qualification and interests).

Regarding claim 46,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **wherein the narrowed hit-list of resources provided from the searched hit-list** (See Talib: at least Fig. 5-10, [0047], and [0055]-[0060], and [0102]-[0105]).

Claims 3, 14-16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Vianello, US 7,424,438 B2 in view of Talib et al., US

2001/0049674 A1 and further in view of Coiera et al., US 2005/0086204 A1

published Apr. 21, 2005 (Coiera, hereafter).

Regarding claim 3,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses all the limitations as stated

above including **displaying, in response to a user query, resources of the hit-**

**list for user inspection; maintaining a list of resources displayed for**

**inspection by the user** (See Vianello: Fig. 4 and Fig. 10 displaying and storing

search results)**.** However, it does not explicitly teach **displaying a search**

**history of search queries previously entered by a user, including a list of**

**resources previously displayed; allowing the user to back-navigate to a**

**search within the search history by displaying the corresponding hit-list;**

**and displaying the list of inspected resources as the hit-list.** On the other

hand, Coiera discloses using saved search queries (i.e., history) and displaying

the save a list of saved search queries to a user allowing the user to back-

navigate the search the saved searches and displaying search results (See

Coiera: Fig. 8, [0016], and [0061]-[0062])**.** Therefore, it would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further

modify the teachings of the combination of Vianello and Talib with Coiera's

teaching. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to incorporate the above

teachings of Coiera into the teachings of the combination of Vianello and Talib in

order to display a search history of search queries previously entered by a user,

including a list of resources previously displayed; allow the user to back-navigate

to a search within the search history by displaying the corresponding hit-list; and

display the list of inspected resources as the hit-list. The motivation for doing so

would have been to increase the utility of the search system and saving user's

time by allowing a user to select the previous keywords without spending

too much time looking for keywords.

Regarding claim 14,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses all the limitations as stated

above including receiving attributes. However, it does not explicitly teach

**receiving a search template from the user.** On the other hand, Coiera

discloses receiving a search template from a user (See Coiera: [0004]-[0006]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to further modify the teachings of the combination of

Vianello and Talib with Coiera's teaching. A skilled artisan would have been

motivated to incorporate the above teachings of Coiera into the teachings of the

combination of Vianello and Talib in order to receive a search template from the

user. The motivation for doing so would have been to increase the utility of the

search system and saving user's time by allowing a user to use a base layout

and pre-stored search parameters to compose a query.

Regarding claim 15,

the combination of Vianello and Talib, and Coiera discloses **the search**

**template is defined by the user** (See Coiera: [0004]-[0006]).

Regarding claim 16,

the combination of Vianello and Talib, and Coiera discloses **the search template comprises a multi-resource query that returns resources of more than one resource type** (See Coiera: [0004]-[0006] and Fig. 9-11).

Regarding claim 18,

the combination of Vianello and Talib, and Coiera discloses **saving and re-using the search template can be saved and reused** (See Coiera: [0004]-[0006]).


Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vianello, US 7,424,438 B2 in view of Talib et al., US 2001/0049674 A1 further in view of Coiera et al., US 2005/0086204 A1 and further in view of Nardozzi et al., US 6,636,837 B1 issued Oct. 21, 2003 (Nardozzi, hereafter).

The combination of Vianello and Talib, and Coiera discloses teaches all the limitations as stated above. However, it does not explicitly teach that **the search template is auto-configured based on the resource type, attributes or facets.** On the other hand, Nardozzi teaches the technique of allowing the automatic customizing of the screen for the user based on the past history or personal information of the user (see col. 7, lines 8-15, Nardozzi). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made having the teachings of Nardozzi to further modify the combination of Vianello and Talib, and Coiera with Nardozzi's teachings.  A skilled artisan would

have been motivated to incorporated the technique of allowing the automatic

customizing of the screen for the user based on the past history or personal

information of the user (see col. 7, lines 8-15, Nardozzi) with search template of

the combination of Vianello and Talib, and Coiera in order to auto-customized

(i.e., auto-configured) the search template based on the resource type because it

facilitates the searching based on the user preferences resulting in saving time

for the user.


Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Vianello, US 7,424,438 B2 in view of Talib et al., US

2001/0049674 A1 further in view of Coiera et al., US 2005/0086204 A1 and

further in view of Jenkins, US 7,392,254 B1 issued June 24, 2008.

Regarding claim 19,

the combination of Vianello and Talib, and Coiera discloses teaches all the

limitations as stated above. However, it does not explicitly teach that **using the**

**hit-list to create a community, the community only including user sharing**

**the first attributes.** On the other hand, Jenkins discloses creating a group of

users (i.e., community) using the search results sharing the same keywords (See

Jenkins: col. 9, lines 1-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to further modify the

combination of Vianello and Talib, and Coiera with Jenkins's teachings.  A skilled

artisan would have been motivated to incorporated the above teachings of

Jenkins the combination of Vianello and Talib, and Coiera in order to create a

community using the hit-list, the community only including user sharing the first

attributes. The motivation for doing so would have been to help users involved in

common interests achieve their goals by collaborating and using each other

knowledge.

Regarding claims 20,

the combination of Vianello and Talib, Coiera, and Jenkins discloses

**providing contact information in response to a user query to enable**

**communication with resources in the community** (See Jenkins: col. 9, lines

48-63)**.**

## *Conclusion*

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection

presented in this Office action.  Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**.

See MPEP § 706.07(a).  Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as

set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire

THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.  In the event a first reply is

filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory

action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory

period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory

action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action.  In no event, however, will

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

## *Points of Contacts*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hares Jami whose telephone number is 571-270-1291. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on 571-272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Hares Jami
Examiner Art Unit 2162


/Hares  Jami/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162